

## THE DEVELOPMENT OF PRAGMATICS AND PRAGMATIC ANALYSIS IN ENGLISH LANGUAGE

**Akhmedov O.S**

DSc., professor UzSWLU

**Normetova Munira**

master student of Urgench State University

### ABSTRACT

In this article the author investigates about the development of pragmatics as an independent branch of linguistics, importance and number of issues raised, main conceptions and principles. Since language is studied more deeply, the abstract meaning which is not shown in form is began to be understood and analyze what speaker is willing to say and listener can understand. The author provides a brief and clear information about pragmatics and its explanations.

**Key words:** pragmatics, concept, pragmatic situations, semiotic system, interpreter, Interpersonal, framework, determination, pragmatic feature, content,

In the 1960s and 1970s of the previous century, pragmatics was established as a distinct field of linguistics. In 1970, Dordrecht played host to an international conference on “Natural Pragmatics.” The conclusion of the conference, as stated by M. Bar-Hillel, professor of Tel-Aviv University and editor of the collection of lectures read at this conference, was that “pragmatic features of natural language communication should be studied within the framework of linguistic theory, as well as syntactic and semantic features of this communication.” From the same time, which was recognized as the “period of rebirth” of pragmatics, a real pragmatic upsurge occurred in foreign linguist. On the one hand, this is proof that the importance of the field, the number of issues raised, and the relevance of the chosen direction attract everyone’s attention. Secondly, it should not be forgotten that the lack of clarity of the subject of the field, the confusion of the principles, the applied principle, causes the chaotic application of concepts and the uncertainty of the conclusions. In recent years, it is no exaggeration to say that a linguist who does not use the term “pragmatics” has not grown old. As a result, a unique pragmatic situation of “fetishism” has appeared, and it is becoming increasingly difficult to find any information about its content, except for the use of the term in the studies carried out

If the term is employed, it may result in a narrowing of the concept it is founded on. We must also consider the following questions before discussing the pragmatic characteristics of language units and their pragmatic analysis: “What does pragmatics do?,” “What is its study target and subject?,” and “What are the key concepts and principles of pragmatics?” G. Klaus was one of the first to identify the field of pragmatics. His definition of pragmatics in the aforementioned work is “the study of the link between signs and the humans who make, transmit, and receive these linguistic signs.”

As this definition makes clear, G. Klaus, like other semioticians (Ch. Peirce, Ch. Morris, and S. Stepanov), does not stray from the connection between the sign and the interpreter when defining the subject of pragmatics. Even his assertion in the conclusion-“Pragmatics is basically a theory that investigates the psychological and sociological dimensions of linguistic signs”-is merely a limited definition of the term pragmatics can be imagined as follows: pragmatics is a special field of linguistics, the scope of which is to study the selection of linguistic units in the process of communication, their use, and the impact of these units on communication participants. These rules are studied as a context in a broad sense, in relation to the conditions of communication

True, taking into account the possibilities of the sign to enter into relations is important to distinguish the parts of the semiotic system and to determine their mutual relations. Without it, the place of pragmatics in the semiotic process cannot be known. But when the relationship between the participants of this process is considered as a bilateral relationship (sign - interpreter), the definition of pragmatics takes only a formal form. It is true that taking into account the possibilities of the sign to enter into relations is important to distinguish the parts of the semiotic system and to determine their mutual relations. Without it, the place of pragmatics in the semiotic process cannot be known. But when the relationship between the participants of this process is considered as a bilateral relationship (sign - interpreter), the definition of pragmatics takes only a formal form.

The wide-scale interpretation of pragmatics is reflected in the inclusion of purposeful types of human action in its scope of research. These two polar interpretations of pragmatics always tend towards each other, and the descriptions given to the concept of pragmatics in different studies seem to complement and clarify each other.

The inclusion of deliberate forms of human action in pragmatics' research area reflects the broad interpretation of pragmatics. The descriptions of pragmatics provided in many studies seem to complement and clarify one other, and these two polar conceptions of pragmatics always tend to overlap. Pragmatics is defined as a science

that studies language from the perspective of a planned goal. It is also defined as a science that studies the language system activated in a speech situation (context), a theory describing speech acts, a theory of conversational (spoken speech) analysis, a study of linguistic tools that express interpersonal relations field, etc.

Therefore, the following is an example of a generic definition of pragmatics: A subfield of linguistics called pragmatics studies how language units are chosen for use in communication, as well as how they are used and how they affect the people who are communicating. These regulations are examined in relation to the circumstances of communication as a context in a wide sense.

These regulations are examined in relation to the circumstances of communication as a context in a wide sense. reduces the current "discontinuities" that exist between them. This kind of analysis of language phenomena enables the identification of the obstacles to and constraints placed on their application in various contexts.

In other words, within the context of its function, the primary objective of linguistic analysis is to determine the nature of the language in relation to its usage in practical activities. The core of the pragmatic method of language analysis is the idea of task (function). We think that theoretical linguistics and practical communication are moving in the same direction as pragmatics. The concept of pragmatics as a research area is vast, necessitating the diversification of this discipline. Because of this, pragmatics has its own "internal" fields, including speech act theory, discourse theory, pragmasemantics, and pragmastylistics. The segmentation of the broad topic of pragmatics into distinct portions and the thorough examination and study of each part are the first ways in which these fields differ from one another.

#### REFERENCES:

1. Safarov Sh. Pragmatics. Tashkent-2008
2. Laurence R.Horn and Gregory Ward. The handbook of pragmatics. Blackwell publishing-2006
3. Tom McArthur, The Oxford Companion to the English Language. Oxford University Press, 1992
4. <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Pragmatics>
5. <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/>